1 2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

PHILIP M. FOSTER,

STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,

٧.

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:12-cv-00496-MMD-VPC

**ORDER** 

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation ("R&R") of the Honorable Valerie P. Cooke, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on August 28, 2013 (dkt. no. 5), regarding Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (dkt no. 1) and Plaintiff's Complaint (dkt. no. 1-1). The R&R recommends that Plaintiff's Application for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis be granted, but that Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed with prejudice.

Plaintiff has filed no objections. This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a de novo determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct

15 16

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

"any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See United States v. Revna-Tapia. 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to which no objections were made); see also Schmidt v. Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in Reyna-Tapia as adopting the view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., Johnstone, 263 F. Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to which no objection was filed).

Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a de novo review to determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cooke's Recommendation. Upon reviewing the Recommendation and underlying papers, this Court finds good cause to adopt the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation in full.

It is hereby ordered that Magistrate Judge Cooke's Report and Recommendation (dkt. no. 5) is accepted and adopted.

It is therefore ordered that Plaintiff's Complaint (dkt. no. 1-1) is dismissed with prejudice.

The Clerk of the Court is instructed to close this case.

DATED THIS 19<sup>th</sup> day of November 2013.

MIRANDA M. DU

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE